

## REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8-11, 13-20, 22-25, 27-29, 31, 32, and 34-37 are pending in the application. In the final Office Action of October 4, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 8-11, 13-20, 22-25, 27-29, 31, 32, and 34-37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Housel III* (U.S. Patent No. 6,535,869) (“*Housel*”) in view of *Megiddo, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,957,224) (“*Megiddo*”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and address the Examiner’s disposition below.

### Regarding claims 1-8, 14-22, 28, 35, and 37:

Independent claims 1, 14, 15, 28, 35, and 37 each claim subject matter relating to receiving a first uniform resource locator (“URL”) of a first length. The first URL corresponds to data identified by a data transmission request expression (e.g., a URL) of a second type. The first URL is replaced with a replacement URL having a second length. The data is retrieved using the replacement URL.

This is clearly unlike *Housel* in view of *Megiddo*, which fails to disclose or suggest replacing a received first URL having a first length with a second URL having a second length to retrieve data. The Examiner argues that *Housel* replaces a received URL with a hash key, but *Housel* makes no such teaching. *Office Action of 10/4/06*, page 13. Specifically, the Examiner cites *Housel* 8:65-67. In the text immediately preceding *Housel* 8:65-67, *Housel* describes that data may be indexed in a variety of manners. *Housel* 8:46-59. One way to index the data is to use a URL as a record key in an index. *Housel* 8:60-64. *Housel* 8:65-67 then describes that another way to index the data is to use a hash key, which “will typically be much shorter than a URL.” Thus, *Housel* does not teach replacing a received URL with a hash key, but instead merely teaches that a hash key may be used instead of a URL to index data.

Unlike Applicants’ claimed invention, nowhere does *Housel* disclose or suggest replacing a received first URL with a replacement URL to retrieve data. In fact, *Housel* fails to teach replacing a received URL with anything. Instead, *Housel* merely teaches that a hash key may be used to index data instead of a URL. *Housel* does not replace a received URL with a hash record key.

*Megiddo* discloses shorthand links that are associated with registered URLs. *Megiddo* 2:47-49. Unlike Applicants’ claimed invention, nowhere does *Megiddo* disclose or suggest replacing a first URL with a replacement URL to retrieve data. Therefore, *Housel* in view of *Megiddo* still fails to disclose or suggest claims 1 and 15.

Claims 2-6, 8, 16-20, and 22 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1 or 15 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1 and 15 are allowable.

Regarding claims 29-31:

Independent claim 29 claims subject matter relating to receiving a first uniform resource locator (“URL”) of a first length. The first URL corresponds to data identified by a data transmission request expression (e.g., a URL) of a first type. The first URL is replaced with a replacement URL having a second length. The data is retrieved using the replacement URL.

This is clearly unlike *Housel* in view of *Megiddo*, which fails to disclose or suggest replacing a received first URL having a first length with a second URL having a second length to retrieve data. As discussed above, *Housel* in view of *Megiddo* fails to disclose or suggest replacing a received URL with anything, let alone another URL of a different length. Therefore, *Housel* in view of *Megiddo* still fails to disclose or suggest claim 29.

Claim 31 depends directly or indirectly from claim 29 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 29 is allowable.

Regarding claims 9-13, 23-27, 32-34, and 36:

Claims 9, 23, and 36 have been amended to clarify that the retrieved data includes a first uniform resource locator (“URL”) of a first length.

Independent claims 9, 23, 32, and 36 each claim subject matter relating to a retrieved data having a first URL of a first length. The first URL is replaced with a replacement URL having a second length. The retrieved data with the replacement URL is sent to a requestor.

This is clearly unlike *Housel* in view of *Megiddo*, which fails to disclose or suggest a retrieved data that includes a first URL having a first length that is replaced with a second URL having a second length. The Examiner argues that *Housel* 8:65-67 teaches that a first URL, which is stored in a retrieved data, is replaced with a second URL, however, that passage fails to relate to replacing a URL in retrieved data with other another URL. *Office Action of 10/4/06*, page 13. As discussed above, *Housel* 8:65-67 merely describes that a hash key may be used instead of a URL to index data. This is unrelated to replacing information that is within retrieved data. In fact, nowhere does *Housel* suggest replacing a URL, which is within retrieved data, with another URL of another length.

*Megiddo* also fails to disclose or suggest replacing a first URL, which is in retrieved data, with a replacement URL. Therefore, *Housel* in view of *Megiddo* still fails to disclose or suggest claims 9, 23, 32, and 36.

Claims 10, 11, 13, 24, 25, 27, and 34 depend directly or indirectly from claims 9, 23, or 32 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 9, 23, and 32 are allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-6, 8-11, 13-20, 22-25, 27-29, 31, 32, and 34-37, are patentable. It is therefore submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Christopher P. Rauch/ (Reg. No. 45,034)  
Christopher P. Rauch  
SONNENSCHNEIN, NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP  
P.O. Box #061080  
Wacker Drive Station - Sears Tower  
Chicago, IL 60606-1080  
Telephone 312/876-2606  
Customer #26263  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)